

# Exhibit 13

BRUCE L. MAILMAN (CNMI Bar #F0153)  
MAYA B. KARA (CNMI Bar #F0169)  
Mailman & Kara, LLC  
PMB 238 PPP, Box 10,000  
Saipan, MP 96950  
Tel:(670)233-0081  
Fax: (670)233-0090



**E-FILED**  
**CNMI SUPERIOR COURT**  
E-filed: May 8 2007 9:03PM  
Clerk Review: May 09, 2007  
Filing ID: 14755950  
Case Number: 06-0119-CV  
Elsa Duenas

A handwritten signature in black ink, likely of Elsa Duenas, the court clerk.

CARLSMITH BALL LLP  
SEAN E. FRINK, (CNMI Bar #F0212)  
Carlsmith Building, Capitol Hill  
P.O. Box 5241  
Saipan, MP 96950-5241  
Tel No. 670.322.3455

Attorneys for Defendants  
Prasada Reddy Goluguri, Pramuan  
Jaiphakdee, and Wilai Promchai

IN THE SUPERIOR COURT  
OF THE  
COMMONWEALTH OF THE NORTHERN MARIANA ISLANDS

Joaquin Q. Atalig,  
Plaintiff,

vs.

OKP (CNMI) Corporation, *et al.*,  
Defendants.

CIVIL ACTION NO. 06-0119

PRASADA REDDY GOLUGURI,  
PRAMUAN JAIPHAKDEE, AND  
WILAI PROMCHAI'S  
ANSWER TO  
THE SECOND AMENDED COMPLAINT

**I.**

**ANSWER**

Defendants Prasada Reddy Goluguri ("Goluguri"), Pramuan Jaiphakdee ("Jaiphakdee"),  
and Wilai Promchai ("Promchai") (hereinafter collectively referred to as the "Employee  
Defendants" and unless otherwise indicated, all responses within the Answer are made on  
behalf of the Employee Defendants), by and through their attorneys, hereby respond to each

1 and every numbered paragraph of the *Second Amended Complaint For Breach of Contract and*  
2 *Tort Claims and For Relief Under the Open Government Meetings and Records Act and*  
3 *Demand For Jury Trial* ( the “SAC”) filed by Plaintiff Joaquin Q. Atalig (“Atalig”) as follows:

4 1. Answering Paragraphs 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18,  
5 19, 20, 21, 22, and 23, the allegations contained therein are merely argument, not well pleaded  
6 facts, and therefore, do not require a response. If, however, it is determined that a response is  
7 required, the allegations contained within Paragraphs 1 through 23 are denied.

8  
9 2. Answering Paragraph 24, the Employee Defendants admit that this Court has  
10 jurisdiction pursuant to Article IV, § 2 of the N.M.I. Constitution and 1 CMC § 3202. The  
11 remaining allegations contained with Paragraph 24 are denied.

12 3. Answering Paragraph 25, the allegations contained therein are denied.

13  
14 4. Answering Paragraph 26, the Employee Defendants have insufficient information  
15 to form a belief whether the facts alleged in the paragraph are true and therefore the allegations  
16 contained within this paragraph are denied.

17 5. Answering Paragraph 27, the Employee Defendants admit that OKP (CNMI)  
18 Corporation is a CNMI Corporation. As to the remaining allegations contained in Paragraph 27,  
19 the Employee Defendants have insufficient information to form a belief whether the facts alleged  
20 in the paragraph are true and therefore the allegations contained within this paragraph are denied.

21  
22 6. Answering Paragraph 28, the Employee Defendants have insufficient information  
23 to form a belief whether the facts alleged in the paragraph are true and therefore the allegations  
24 contained within this paragraph are denied.

25 7. Answering Paragraph 29, the Employee Defendants have insufficient information  
26 to form a belief whether the facts alleged in the paragraph are true and therefore the allegations  
27 contained within this paragraph are denied.  
28

1           8.       Answering Paragraph 30, it is admitted that Prasada Reddy Goluguri is a non-  
2 resident worker employed by OKP as a Project Engineer and that he is not licensed to practice  
3 engineering in the CNMI. The remaining allegations contained in Paragraph 30 are denied.

4           9.       Answering Paragraph 31, it is admitted that Pramuan Jaiphakdee is a non-resident  
5 worker employed by OKP as a Heavy Equipment Operator. The remaining allegations contained  
6 within Paragraph 31 are denied.

7           10.      Answering Paragraph 32, it is admitted that Wilai Promchai is a non-resident  
8 worker employed by OKP as a Heavy Equipment Operator and that the Court Ordered that he  
9 could not be sued for any alleged damage occurring prior to December 30, 2005. The remaining  
10 allegations contained within paragraph 32 are denied.

11           11.      Answering Paragraph 33, 34, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 40, 41, 42, and 43, the Employee  
12 Defendants have insufficient information to form a belief whether the facts alleged in these  
13 paragraphs are true and therefore the allegations contained within these paragraphs are denied.

14           12.      Answering Paragraph 44, it is admitted that OKP and the Commonwealth Ports  
15 Authority entered into a construction contract related to the Rota International Airport runway.  
16 Regarding the remaining allegations contained within Paragraph 44, the Employee Defendants  
17 have insufficient information to form a belief whether the facts alleged are true and therefore the  
18 allegations are denied.

19           13.      Answering Paragraphs 45, 46, 47, 48, 49, 50, 51, 52, 53, 54, 55, 56, 57, 58, 59,  
20 60, 61, 62, 63, 64, 65, 66, and 67 the Employee Defendants have insufficient information to form  
21 a belief whether the facts alleged in the paragraphs are true and therefore the allegations  
22 contained within this paragraph are denied.

23           14.      Answering Paragraph 68, the Employee Defendants repeat and reallege their  
24 answers in response to the realleged paragraphs as though fully set forth herein.  
25  
26  
27  
28

1           15.     Answering Paragraph 69, 70, 71, 72, 73, and 74, the Employee Defendants have  
2 insufficient information to form a belief whether the facts alleged in the paragraphs are true and  
3 therefore the allegations contained within the paragraphs are denied.

4           16.     Answering Paragraph 75, the Employee Defendants repeat and reallege their  
5 answers in response to the realleged paragraphs as though fully set forth herein.

6           17.     Answering Paragraph 76, 77, and 78 the allegations contained therein are denied.

7           18.     Answering Paragraph 79, the Employee Defendants repeat and reallege their  
8 answers in response to the realleged paragraphs as though fully set forth herein.

9           19.     Answering Paragraphs 80, 81, 82, and 83, the allegations contained therein are not  
10 made against the Employee Defendants. Therefore, no answer to such allegations is required of  
11 them. To the extent it is determined otherwise, the allegations contained within Paragraphs 80,  
12 81, 82, and 83 are denied.

13           20.     Answering Paragraph 84, the Employee Defendants repeat and reallege their  
14 answers in response to the realleged paragraphs as though fully set forth herein.

15           21.     Answering Paragraphs 85, 86, 87, 88 (including subparagraphs a through j), 89,  
16 90, and 91, the Employee Defendants have insufficient information to form a belief whether the  
17 facts alleged in these paragraphs are true and therefore the allegations contained within these  
18 paragraphs are denied.

19           22.     Answering Paragraph 92, the allegations constitute an intermediate prayer for  
20 relief and contain no factual allegations and, as such, do not require an answer. To the extent it  
21 is determined otherwise, the allegations contained within Paragraph 92 are denied.

22           23.     Answering Paragraph 93, the Employee Defendants repeat and reallege their  
23 answers in response to the realleged paragraphs as though fully set forth herein.

1           24.     Answering Paragraph 94, 95, 97, 98, the Employee Defendants have insufficient  
2 information to form a belief whether the facts alleged in the paragraphs are true and therefore the  
3 allegations contained within the paragraphs are denied.

4           25.     Answering Paragraphs 96 (including subparagraphs a through e), 99, and 100, the  
5 allegations contained therein are denied.

6           26.     Answering Paragraph 101, the allegations constitute an intermediate prayer for  
7 relief and contain no factual allegations and, as such, do not require an answer. To the extent it  
8 is determined otherwise, the allegations contained within Paragraph 101 are denied.

9           27.     Answering Paragraph 102, the Employee Defendants repeat and reallege their  
10 answers in response to the realleged paragraphs as though fully set forth herein.

11           28.     Answering Paragraph 103, the Employee Defendants have insufficient  
12 information to form a belief whether the facts alleged in the paragraphs are true and therefore the  
13 allegations contained within the paragraphs are denied.

14           29.     Answering Paragraphs 104, 105, and 106, the allegations contained therein are  
15 denied.

16           30.     Answering Paragraph 107, the allegations constitute an intermediate prayer for  
17 relief and contain no factual allegations and, as such, do not require an answer. To the extent it  
18 is determined otherwise, the allegations contained within Paragraph 107 are denied.

19           31.     Answering Paragraph 108, the Employee Defendants repeat and reallege their  
20 answers in response to the realleged paragraphs as though fully set forth herein.

21           32.     Answering Paragraphs 109, 110, 111, and 112, the allegations contained therein  
22 are denied.

1           33.     Answering Paragraph 113, the allegations constitute an intermediate prayer for  
2 relief and contain no factual allegations and, as such, do not require an answer. To the extent it  
3 is determined otherwise, the allegations contained within Paragraph 113 are denied.

4           34.     Answering Paragraph 114, the Employee Defendants repeat and reallege their  
5 answers in response to the realleged paragraphs as though fully set forth herein.

6           35.     Answering Paragraph 115 and 121, the Employee Defendants have insufficient  
7 information to form a belief whether the facts alleged in the paragraphs are true and therefore the  
8 allegations contained within the paragraphs are denied.

9           36.     Answering Paragraphs 116, 117, and 118 the allegations contained therein are  
10 denied.

11           37.     Answering Paragraph 119, the allegations constitute an intermediate prayer for  
12 relief and contain no factual allegations and, as such, do not require an answer. To the extent it  
13 is determined otherwise, the allegations contained within Paragraph 119 are denied.

14           38.     Answering Paragraph 120, the Employee Defendants repeat and reallege their  
15 answers in response to the realleged paragraphs as though fully set forth herein.

16           39.     Answering Paragraphs 122, 123, and 124, the allegations contained therein are  
17 denied.

18           40.     Answering Paragraph 125, the allegations constitute an intermediate prayer for  
19 relief and contain no factual allegations and, as such, do not require an answer. To the extent it  
20 is determined otherwise, the allegations contained within Paragraph 125 are denied.

21           41.     Answering Paragraph 126, the Employee Defendants repeat and reallege their  
22 answers in response to the realleged paragraphs as though fully set forth herein.

1           42.     Answering Paragraphs 127, 128, and 129, the Employee Defendants have  
2 insufficient information to form a belief whether the facts alleged in the paragraphs are true and  
3 therefore the allegations contained within the paragraphs are denied.

4           43.     Answering Paragraph 130, the allegations constitute an intermediate prayer for  
5 relief and contain no factual allegations and, as such, do not require an answer. To the extent it  
6 is determined otherwise, the allegations contained within Paragraph 130 are denied.

7           44.     Answering Paragraph 131, the Employee Defendants repeat and reallege their  
8 answers in response to the realleged paragraphs as though fully set forth herein.

9           45.     Answering Paragraph 132, the allegations constitute an explanation of plaintiff's  
10 theory of liability against defendant OKP (CNMI) Corporation ("OKP") and contain no factual  
11 allegations and, as such, do not require an answer. To the extent it is determined otherwise, the  
12 allegations contained within Paragraph 132 are denied.

13           46.     Answering Paragraph 133, the allegations constitute an explanation of plaintiff's  
14 theory of liability against the Employee Defendants and Defendant Chen and contain no factual  
15 allegations and, as such, do not require an answer. To the extent it is determined otherwise, the  
16 allegations contained within Paragraph 133 are denied.

17           47.     Answering Paragraphs 134, 135, 136, 138, 139, 140, and 141, the allegations  
18 contained therein are denied.

19           48.     Answering Paragraph 137, the Employee Defendants have insufficient  
20 information to form a belief whether the facts alleged in the paragraph are true and therefore the  
21 allegations contained within Paragraph 137 are denied.

22           49.     Answering Paragraph 142, the allegations constitute an intermediate prayer for  
23 relief and contain no factual allegations and, as such, do not require an answer. To the extent it  
24 is determined otherwise, the allegations contained within Paragraph 142 are denied.



1           50.     Answering Paragraph 143, the Employee Defendants repeat and reallege their  
2 answers in response to the realleged paragraphs as though fully set forth herein.

3           51.     Answering Paragraphs 144, 145, 146, 147, 148, 149, 150, 151, and 152, the  
4 allegations contained therein are not made against the Employee Defendants. Therefore, no  
5 answer to such allegations is required of them. To the extent it is determined otherwise, the  
6 allegations contained within Paragraphs 144, 145, 146, 147, 148, 149, 150, 151, and 152, are  
7 denied.  
8

9           52.     Answering Paragraph 153, the allegations constitute an intermediate prayer for  
10 relief and contain no factual allegations and, as such, do not require an answer. To the extent it  
11 is determined otherwise, the allegations contained within Paragraph 153 are denied.  
12

13           53.     Answering Paragraphs 154, 155, 156, 157, 158, 159, 160, 161, 162, 163, 164,  
14 165, and 166, the allegations are contained therein are levied against a defendant other than the  
15 Employee Defendants and, as such, do not require an answer. To the extent it is determined  
16 otherwise, the allegations contained within Paragraphs 154, 155, 156, 157, 158, 159, 160, 161,  
17 162, 163, 164, 165, and 166 are denied.

18           54.     Answering Paragraph 167, the Employee Defendants repeat and reallege their  
19 answers in response to the realleged paragraphs as though fully set forth herein.  
20

21           55.     Answering Paragraphs 168 and 169, the allegations are contained therein are  
22 levied against a defendant other than the Employee Defendants and, as such, do not require an  
23 answer. To the extent it is determined otherwise, the allegations contained within Paragraphs  
24 168 and 169 are denied.

25           56.     Answering Paragraph 170, the allegations constitute an intermediate prayer for  
26 relief and contain no factual allegations and, as such, do not require an answer. To the extent it  
27 is determined otherwise, the allegations contained within Paragraph 170 are denied.  
28

1           57. The Employee Defendants deny all allegations in the SAC except for those  
2 allegations expressly admitted herein.

3  
4                                   **II.**  
                                 **AFFIRMATIVE AND CERTAIN OTHER DEFENSES**

5           As defenses to the SAC, the Employee Defendants set forth the following

- 6           1. Plaintiff fails to state a claim upon which relief can be granted.
- 7           2. Plaintiff's claims are barred by the doctrine of unclean hands.
- 8           3. Plaintiff's claims are barred by the doctrine of Estoppel.
- 9           4. Plaintiff's claims are barred or limited by the doctrine of comparative fault.
- 10          5. Plaintiff's claims are barred or limited because plaintiff has not suffered damage  
11 and/or because plaintiff has failed to mitigate damages.
- 12          6. Plaintiff's claims are barred or limited because the actions of the Employee  
13 Defendants and others were at all relevant times reasonable and legal.
- 14          7. Plaintiff's claims are barred because he lacks standing to bring them.
- 15          8. Plaintiff's claims are barred or limited because he consented to the actions taken  
16 by the Employee Defendants.
- 17          9. This action should be dismissed or transferred for improper venue and/or under  
18 the doctrine of *forum non conveniens*.
- 19          10. The allegations contained within the SAC fail to state a claim upon which  
20 punitive damages are available.
- 21          11. Plaintiff's demand for punitive damages is barred by the due process clause of the  
22 Fifth and Fourteenth Amendments of the United States Constitution and the corresponding  
23 language of the CNMI Constitution.
- 24          12. The allegations contained within the SAC fail to state a claim upon which  
25 restitution is available.
- 26  
27  
28

1           13.     The allegations contained within the SAC fail to state a claim upon which  
2 emotional distress damages are available.

3           14.     The allegations contained within the SAC fail to state a claim upon which  
4 payment for attorneys' fees and/or costs are available.

5           15.     The allegations contained within the SAC fail to state a claim upon which a  
6 temporary restraining order or injunction is available.

7           16.     The allegations contained within the SAC fail to state a claim upon which interest  
8 is available.

9           17.     Plaintiff is not entitled to trial by jury for matters or issues arising in equity or for  
10 claims in the amount of less than one thousand dollars.

11           18.     Plaintiff's injuries are caused, in whole or in part, by his own negligent and/or  
12 improper actions and not by any action of the Employee Defendants or others.

13           19.     Plaintiff's claims are barred by the doctrine of laches.

14           20.     Plaintiff's claims are barred or limited because plaintiff directed the Employee  
15 Defendants to take the actions complained of.

16           21.     Plaintiff's claims are barred against Defendant Promchai for any acts or  
17 allegations occurring before December 30, 2005.

18           The Employee Defendants reserve their right to assert additional defenses if future  
19 discovery reveals such defenses to be appropriate.

20           **WHEREFORE, The Employee Defendants** pray that:

21           1. Plaintiff take nothing by the Second Amended Complaint.

22           2. That in the event that Plaintiff is found to be entitled to any damages, the degree of  
23 negligence, responsibility or fault of each party who contributed to said damages be determined  
24 and the Employee Defendants be held liable only for that portion of damages which corresponds  
25 to their individual degree(s) of fault or responsibility.

1 3. The Employee Defendants be awarded their costs of suit incurred herein.

2 4. For such other and further relief as the Court may deem just and proper.

3 DATED: May 8, 2007.

4  
5 /s/

6 SEAN E. FRINK, CNMI BAR # F0212  
CARLSMITH BALL, LLP

7 BRUCE L. MAILMAN (CNMI Bar #F0153)  
8 MAYA B. KARA (CNMI Bar #F0169)  
MAILMAN & KARA, LLC

9 Attorneys for Defendants Prasada Reddy  
10 Goluguri, Pramuan Jaiphakdee, and Wilai  
Promchai  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28